REMARKS:

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory matter.

Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,055,515 to Consentino *et al.* ("*Consentino*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,668 to Chipman et al. ("*Chipman*").

Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Consentino* in view of *Chipman* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,789,091 B2 to Victor Gogolak ("*Gogolak*").

A Final Office Action in the subject Application was mailed to the undersigned on 3 October 2006, which provides for a response period ending 3 January 2007. The Applicant filed an Amendment After Final on 4 December 2007 (since 3 December 2006 was a Sunday), within two (2) months of the date of the Final Office Action. An Advisory Action was mailed to the undersigned on 22 December 2006. The Advisory Action stated that the proposed Amendments filed on 4 December 2006 will not be entered because they raise new issues that require further consideration and/or search. (22 December 2006 Advisory Action, Page 1). The Applicant respectfully reiterates here the arguments set forth in the Amendment After Final filed on 4 December 2006, as if fully set forth herein.

Initially, the Applicant respectfully notes that *Gogolak*, which issued on 7 September 2004, was filed on 2 May 2001, with no claim of priority to an earlier date. The subject Application was filed on 28 June 2001. The Applicant believes, however, that the Applicant will be able to satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R § 131 by filing a declaration showing a completion of the present invention prior to 2 May 2001, and respectfully reserves Applicant's right to do so in the future during the pendency of the subject Application. The Applicant also believes, however, that the present invention is not

disclosed or fairly suggested by *Gogolak*, and therefore, transverses the rejection of Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 for the reasons recited below.

Although the Applicant believes Claims 1-37 are directed to patentable subject matter without amendment, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9, 12, 20, 23, 31 and 34-37 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicant's invention. By making these amendments, the Applicant makes no admission concerning the merits of the Examiner's rejection, and respectfully reserves the right to address any statement or averment of the Examiner not specifically addressed in this response. Particularly, the Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue broader claims in this Application or through a continuation patent application. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to Claims 34-37.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory matter.

The Examiner specifically states that Claims 1-37 "fail to recite any physical transformation to establish a practical application that produces any tangible, useful, or concrete results that will be returned to the system". (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 2). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, the Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, 34-37 and dependent Claims 9, 20, and 31 in an effort to expedite prosecution of this Application and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. By making these amendments, the Applicant does not indicate agreement with or acquiescence to the Examiner's position with respect to the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as set forth in the Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-37 are considered to be in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and that Claims 1-37 be allowed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection to Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Consentino* in view of *Chipman.*

Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Consentino* in view of *Chipman* and in further view of *Gogolak.*

Although the Applicant believes Claims 1-37 are directed to patentable subject matter without amendment, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9, 12, 20, 23, 31 and 34-37 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicant's invention. By making these amendments, the Applicant does not indicate agreement with or acquiescence to the Examiner's position with respect to the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as set forth in the Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Consentino* or *Chipman*, either individually or in combination, fails to disclose each and every limitation recited by Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37. The Applicant further respectfully submits that *Consentino* or *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33. Thus, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's obvious rejection of Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the proposed combination of *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination.

The Proposed *Consentino-Chipman* Combination Fails to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Various Limitations Recited in Applicant's Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37

For example, with respect to amended independent Claim 1, this claim recites:

> A computer-implemented *system for categorizing product data in an electronic commerce transaction*, the system comprising *a data association module operable to*:
> *access a first product classification schema*, the first schema comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes for categorizing products, the first schema further comprising ontologies associated with one or more of the classes, each ontology comprising one or more product attributes;
> *access target data to be associated with the first schema*, the target data organized according to a second product classification schema;
> *determine one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison*, without translating the target data from the second schema to the first schema, between the target data and the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema or between the target data and values for one or more of the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema;
> *associate the at least a portion of the target data with one or more classes of the first schema in response to determining*, based on the automatic comparison, *the one or more classes of the first schema* with which the at least a portion of the target data is associated; and
> store the values for one or more of the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema with which the target data is compared in the one or more seller databases. (Emphasis Added).

Amended independent Claims 12, 23, and 34-37 recite similar limitations. *Consentino* or *Chipman* fail to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Consentino* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest amended independent Claim 1 limitations regarding a "computer-implemented *system for categorizing product data in an electronic commerce transaction*" and in particular *Consentino* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest amended independent Claim 1

limitations regarding "*determine[ing] one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison*, without translating the target data from the second schema to the first schema, between the target data and the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema or between the target data and values for one or more of the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema". In particular, the Examiner equates "*determine[ing] one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison*" recited in amended independent Claim 1 with a user that must "*determine the product description by clicking on the node*" disclosed in *Consentino*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 4). (Emphasis Added).

However, "*clicking on the node*" *disclosed in Consentino* merely allows a user to determine the product description and to look at its parameters, and *does not include, involve, or even relate to* "*determine[ing] one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison*", *as recited in amended independent Claim 1*. (Column 6, Lines 42-48). In contrast, "*determine[ing] one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison*" recited in amended independent Claim 1 provides for an "*automatic comparison*". Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner's comparison between *Consentino* and amended independent Claim 1 cannot be made. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish amended independent Claim 1 from *Consentino*.

The Office Action Acknowledges that *Consentino* Fails to Disclose Various Limitations Recited in Applicant's Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicant agrees, that *Consentino* fails to disclose the emphasized limitations noted above in amended independent Claim 1. Specifically the Examiner acknowledges that *Consentino* fails to "provide detail explanation for categorizing product data in an electronic

commerce transaction." (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 4). However, the Examiner asserts that the cited portions of *Chipman* disclose the acknowledged shortcomings in *Consentino*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in *Chipman*.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Chipman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest amended independent Claim 1 limitations regarding a "computer-implemented **system for categorizing product data in an electronic commerce transaction**". In particular, the Examiner equates the "**system for categorizing product data**" recited in amended independent Claim 1 with the **cataloging system** disclosed in *Chipman*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 4). (Emphasis Added). However, the **cataloging system disclosed in** *Chipman* merely allows suppliers to publish information in electronic catalogs, and **does not include, involve, or even relate to the** "**system for categorizing product data**", **as recited in amended independent Claim 1**. (Abstract). In contrast, the "**system for categorizing product data**" recited in amended independent Claim 1 provides for a "**data association module**" wherein the **data association module** is operable to "access a first product classification schema", "access target data to be associated with the first schema", "determine one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated based on an automatic comparison", "associate the at least a portion of the target data with one or more classes of the first schema in response to determining", and "store the values [...] in one or more seller databases". Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner's comparison between *Chipman* and amended independent Claim 1 cannot be made. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish amended independent Claim 1 from *Chipman*.

The Office Action Fails to Properly Establish a *Prima Facie* case of Obvious over the Proposed *Consentino-Chipman* Combination

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the proposed combination of *Consentino* or

Chipman, either individually or in combination. The Office Action has not shown the required teaching, suggestion, or motivation in these references or in knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine these references as proposed. The Office Action merely states that "it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to **apply the [...] product cataloging technique as taught by Chipman into Consentino's system**". (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 5). (Emphasis Added). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant further respectfully submits that this purported advantage relied on by the Examiner is nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Consentino* or *Chipman*, either individually or in combination. The Examiner asserts that the motivation to combine the references as proposed would be "because by doing so, [...] the combined invention will not only be upgraded for providing a multi-path hierarchical product cataloging system to allow a user performing interactive e-commerce transactions, but will also be integrated with the data consumed by the user back into the system for facilitating the product cataloging design via the generic portal technique". (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 5). **The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point to the portions of Consentino or Chipman which contain the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine these references for the Examiner's stated purported advantage.** The Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner is using the subject Application as a template to formulate reconstructive hindsight, which constitutes impermissible use of hindsight under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

A recent Federal Circuit case makes it crystal clear that, in an obviousness situation, the **prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art**. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). (Emphasis Added). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35. With respect to the subject Application, the **Examiner has not adequately supported the selection and combination of Consentino or Chipman to render obvious the Applicant's claimed**

invention. The Examiner's unsupported conclusory statements that "it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to *apply the [...] product cataloging technique as taught by Chipman into Consentino's system*" and "because by doing so, [...] the combined invention will not only be upgraded for providing a multi-path hierarchical product cataloging system to allow a user performing interactive e-commerce transactions, but will also be integrated with the data consumed by the user back into the system for facilitating the product cataloging design via the generic portal technique", *does not adequately address the issue of motivation to combine*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 5). This factual question of motivation is material to patentability, and cannot be resolved on subjective belief and unknown authority. *Id.* It is improper, in determining whether a person of ordinary skill would have been led to this combination of references, simply to "[use] that which the inventor taught against its teacher." *W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Thus, *the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation for combining the teachings of Consentino or Chipman*, either individually or in combination.

The Applicant's Claims are Patentable over the proposed *Consentino-Chipman* Combination

With respect to amended independent Claims 12, 23, and 34-37 these claims includes limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with amended independent Claim 1. Thus, amended independent Claims 12, 23, and 34-37 are considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of *Consentino* and *Chipman*, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with amended independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent Claims 2-6, 13-17, and 24-28: Claims 2-6 depend from amended independent Claim 1; Claims 13-17 depend from amended independent Claim 12; and Claims 24-28 depend from amended independent Claim 23. Thus, dependent Claims 2-6, 13-17, and 24-28 are considered patentably distinguishable

over *Consentino* and are also considered to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37 and dependent Claims 2-6, 13-17, and 24-28 are not anticipated by *Consentino*. The Applicant further respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37 and dependent Claims 2-6, 13-17, and 24-28 are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and that Claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, and 34-37 be allowed.

The Proposed *Consentino-Chipman-Gogolak* Combination Fails to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Various Limitations Recited in Applicant's Dependent Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33

As discussed above, the Applicant respectfully reserves the right to satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R § 131 by filing a declaration showing a completion of the present invention prior to 2 May 2001, in the future during the pendency of the subject Application. However, the Applicant believes that the present invention is not disclosed or fairly suggested by *Gogolak*, and therefore, transverses the rejection of Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 for the reasons recited below.

The Office Action Acknowledges that the *Consentino-Chipman* Combination Fails to Disclose Various Limitations Recited in Applicant's Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicant agrees, that the combination of *Consentino* and *Chipman* fail to disclose the limitations in dependent Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 6).

Specifically, the Examiner acknowledges that *Consentino* and *Chipman* do not expressly disclose a "*data association module operable to*" "*us[e] vector space analysis to identify multiple portions of the target data* including values that correspond to values for multiple product attributes included in the ontologies of these

one or more classes of the first schema", "*us[e] statistical correlation techniques to identify portions of the target data* including values that correspond to values for a product attribute included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema", "*the values in the seller databases being identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more classes of the first schema*", "*associat[e] one or more pointers to the target data with the one or more classes of the first schema*", and "*associat[e] one or more pointers to specific portions of the target data with one or more product attributes included in the ontology of the one or more classes of the first schema*", as recited in dependent Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33. (Emphasis Added). However, the Examiner asserts that the cited portions of *Gogolak* disclose the acknowledged shortcomings in *Consentino* and *Chipman*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in *Gogolak*.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest various limitations recited in Applicant's dependent Claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 29, and 30. For example, with respect to dependent Claims 7 and 8, these claims recite:

> 7.   The system of Claim 1, wherein determining one or more classes of the first schema with which the at least a portion of the target data is associated comprises *using vector space analysis to identify multiple portions of the target data* including values that correspond to values for multiple product attributes included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema. (Emphasis Added).

> 8.   The system of Claim 1, wherein determining one or more classes of the first schema with which the at least a portion of the target data is associated comprises *using statistical correlation techniques to identify portions of the target data* including values that correspond to values for a product attribute included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema. (Emphasis Added).

Dependent Claims 18, 19, 29, and 30 recite similar limitations. *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation of dependent Claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 29, and 30.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claims 7 and 8 limitations regarding a "computer-implemented **system for categorizing product data in an electronic commerce transaction**, the system comprising **a data association module**" operable to "**determine one or more classes of the first schema with which at least a portion of the target data is associated**" and in particular *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claims 7 and 8 limitations regarding "using vector space analysis to identify multiple portions of the target data including values that correspond to values for multiple product attributes included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema" and "using statistical correlation techniques to identify portions of the target data including values that correspond to values for a product attribute included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema".

Rather *Gogolak* discloses a "method for accessing and analyzing the adverse effects resulting from the use of at least one drug of interest." (Abstract). It appears that the Examiner is equating using "vector space analysis" and "statistical correlation techniques" recited in dependent Claims 7 and 8 with the "Query Screen" disclosed in *Gogolak*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 6). However, the "Query Screen" disclosed in *Gogolak* merely provides for a search in which a user can choose to search via a generic name, a trade name or a category, **and does not include or is not even related to** using "vector space analysis" or "statistical correlation techniques" as recited in dependent Claims 7 and 8. (Column 15, Lines 54-65). In contrast, using "vector space analysis" and "statistical correlation techniques" recited in dependent Claims 7 and 8 is provided to "identify multiple [or singular] portions of the target data including values that correspond to values for multiple [or singular] product attributes included in the ontologies of these one or more classes of the first schema." Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner's comparison between *Gogolak* and dependent Claims 7 and 8 cannot be made. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish dependent Claims 7 and 8 from *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*.

The Applicant further respectfully submits that the proposed *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest various limitations recited in Applicant's dependent Claims 9, 20, and 31. For example, with respect to dependent Claim 9, this claim recites:

> 9. The system of Claim 1, wherein *the values in the seller databases being identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more classes of the first schema*. (Emphasis Added).

Dependent Claims 20 and 31 recite similar limitations. *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation of dependent Claims 9, 20, and 31.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claim 9 limitations regarding "stor[ing] the values for one or more of the product attributes of the ontologies of the first schema with which the target data is compared in the one or more seller databases" and in particular *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claim 9 limitations regarding "*the values in the seller databases being identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more classes of the first schema*." (Emphasis Added).

It appears that the Examiner is equating the "*values in the seller databases*" recited in dependent Claim 9 with the "structural database" disclosed in *Gogolak*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 6). However, the "structural database" disclosed in *Gogolak* merely provides an ability to keep a consistent vocabulary and data regarding adverse drug reactions, *and does not include or is not even related to* the "*values in the seller databases*", as recited in dependent Claim 9. (Column 21, Lines 23-56). In contrast, the "*values in the seller databases*" recited in dependent Claim 9 are "*identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more classes of the first schema*". Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner's comparison between *Gogolak* and dependent Claim 9 cannot be made. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone

are sufficient to patentably distinguish dependent Claim 9 from *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*.

The Applicant still further respectfully submits that the proposed *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest various limitations recited in Applicant's dependent Claims 10, 11, 21, 22, 32, and 33. For example, with respect to dependent Claims 10 and 11, these claims recite:

> 10. The system of Claim 1, wherein associating the at least a portion of the target data with one or more classes of the first schema comprises ***associating one or more pointers to the target data with the one or more classes of the first schema***. (Emphasis Added).

> 11. The system of Claim 1, wherein associating the at least a portion of the target data with one or more classes of the first schema comprises ***associating one or more pointers to specific portions of the target data with one or more product attributes included in the ontology of the one or more classes of the first schema***. (Emphasis Added).

Dependent Claims 21, 22, 32, and 33 recite similar limitations. *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation of dependent Claims 10, 11, 21, 22, 32, and 33.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claims 10 and 11 limitations regarding a "computer-implemented ***system for categorizing product data in an electronic commerce transaction***, the system comprising ***a data association module***" operable to "***associate the at least a portion of the target data with one or more classes of the first schema in response to determining***, based on the automatic comparison, ***the one or more classes of the first schema*** with which the at least a portion of the target data is associated" and in particular *Gogolak* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest dependent Claims 10 and 11 limitations regarding "***associating one or more pointers to the target data with the one or more classes of the first schema***" and "***associating one or more pointers to specific portions of the target data with one or more product attributes included in the ontology of the one or more classes of the first schema***".

It appears that the Examiner is equating *associating one or more pointers*" recited in dependent Claims 10 and 11 with the "correlated search" disclosed in *Gogolak*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Page 6). However, the "correlated search" disclosed in *Gogolak* merely looks for the association of characteristics of drug information, *and does not include or is not even related to* "associating one or more pointers", as recited in dependent Claims 10 and 11. (Column 21, Lines 23-56). In contrast, "*associating one or more pointers*" recited in dependent Claims 10 and 11 is provided for "*associating one or more pointers to specific portions of the target data with one or more product attributes included in the ontology of the one or more classes of the first schema*". Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner's comparison between *Gogolak* and dependent Claims 10 and 11 cannot be made. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish dependent Claims 10 and 11 from *Consentino*, *Chipman*, and *Gogolak*.

The Office Action Fails to Properly Establish a *Prima Facie* case of Obvious over the Proposed *Consentino-Chipman-Gogolak* Combination

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the proposed combination of *Consentino*, *Chipman*, or *Gogolak*, either individually or in combination. The Office Action has not shown the required teaching, suggestion, or motivation in these references or in knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine these references as proposed. The Office Action merely states that "it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to apply *the well-known technique* into the combined system of *Consentino* and *Chipman* for determining the associations of these attribute-value pairs with the weight calculation to indexing the read/write processing as taught by *Gogolak*". (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Pages 6-7). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant further respectfully submits that this purported advantage relied on by the Examiner is nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Consentino*, *Chipman*, or

Gogolak, either individually or in combination. The Examiner asserts that the motivation to combine the references as proposed would be because "***the surrounding background noise data will be filtered out based on a use desire***." (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Pages 6-7). (Emphasis Added). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and further respectfully requests clarification as to how the Examiner arrives at this conclusion. For example, what is "***the well-known technique*** [...] for determining the associations of these attribute-value pairs" and how does the Examiner arrive at the conclusion that this is a "***well-known technique***" and to what extent does the Examiner purport that this "***well-known technique***" applies to the subject Application. As another example, what is a "***use desire***" and to what extent does the Examiner purport that this "***use desire***" even applies to the subject Application. ***The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point to the portions of Consentino, Chipman, or Gogolak which contain the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine these references for the for the Examiner's stated purported advantage.*** In particular, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point to the portions of *Consentino, Chipman*, or *Gogolak* which expressly state what "***the well-known technique***" is and what a "***use desire***" is and how these apply to the subject Application. The Applicant further submits that the Examiner is using the subject Application as a template to formulate reconstructive hindsight, which constitutes impermissible use of hindsight under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

A recent Federal Circuit case makes it crystal clear that, in an obviousness situation, the ***prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art***. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). (Emphasis Added). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35. With respect to the subject Application, the ***Examiner has not adequately supported the selection and combination of Consentino, Chipman, or Gogolak to render obvious the Applicant's claimed invention***. The Examiner's unsupported conclusory statements that "it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to apply ***the well-known technique*** into the combined system of *Consentino* and *Chipman* for determining the associations of these attribute-value pairs with the weight

calculation to indexing the read/write processing as taught by *Gogolak*" and because "*the surrounding background noise data will be filtered out based on a use desire*", *does not adequately address the issue of motivation to combine*. (3 October 2006 Final Office Action, Pages 6-7). (Emphasis Added). This factual question of motivation is material to patentability, and cannot be resolved on subjective belief and unknown authority. *Id.* It is improper, in determining whether a person of ordinary skill would have been led to this combination of references, simply to "[use] that which the inventor taught against its teacher." *W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Thus, *the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation for combining the teachings of Consentino, Chipman, or Gogolak*, either individually or in combination.

The Applicant's Claims are Patentable over the Proposed *Consentino-Chipman-Gogolak* Combination

The Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37 are considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of *Consentino, Chipman*, and *Gogolak*. This being the case, amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37 are considered to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to dependent Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33: Claims 7-11 depend from amended independent Claim 1; Claims 18-22 depend from amended independent Claim 12; and Claims 29-33 depend from amended independent Claim 23. As mentioned above, each of amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34-37 are considered patentably distinguishable over *Consentino, Chipman*, and *Gogolak*. This being the case, dependent Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 are considered to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

For at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of *Consentino, Chipman*, and *Gogolak*. The Applicant further respectfully submits that Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and that Claims 7-11, 18-22, and 29-33 be allowed.

THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, ***there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings***. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, ***the prior art reference*** (or references when combined) ***must teach or suggest all the claim limitations***. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, ***and not based on applicant's disclosure***. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

With respect to alleged obviousness, ***there must be something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability***, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In fact, the absence of a suggestion to combine is dispositive in an obviousness determination. *Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The mere fact that the prior art can be combined or modified does not make the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. The consistent criterion for determining obviousness is whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likelihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art. Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the Applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991; *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2142.

A recent Federal Circuit case makes it clear that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed in duplicate concurrently herewith to facilitate the processing of this deposit account authorization. **The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the RCE Fee of $790.00 to Deposit Account No. 500777**. Because this Amendment is filed prior to the ending of the response period 3 January 2007 of the Final Office Action mailed on 3 October 2006, no additional fees are deemed to be necessary; however, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.

Respectfully submitted,

_12/29/06_
Date

James E. Walton, Registration No. 47,245
Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274
Daren C. Davis, Registration No. 38,425
Michael Alford, Registration No. 48,707
Law Offices of James E. Walton, P.L.L.C.
1169 N. Burleson Blvd., Suite 107-328
Burleson, Texas 76028
(817) 447-9955 (voice)
(817) 447-9954 (facsimile)
steven@waltonpllc.com (e-mail)

CUSTOMER NO. 53184

ATTORNEYS AND AGENTS FOR APPLICANT